

**INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES**

2006-2007 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT

FOR:

Kumon

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
Tutor Qualifications		Lesson matches original description	Satisfactory	Criminal Background Checks	
Recruiting Materials		Instruction is clear	Satisfactory	Health/safety laws & regulations	
Academic Program		Time on task is appropriate	Satisfactory	Financial viability	
Progress Reporting		Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	Satisfactory		
		Student/instructor ratio: 2:1 or less	Satisfactory		

ACTION NEEDED: NONE

(As per the on-site monitoring rubric instructions, while monitoring/ observation of SES providers is completed annually, document and compliance analysis is completed every two years. Since Kumon's document and compliance analysis was completed during the 2005-2006 school year, only an observation was completed for the 2006-2007 school year).

On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Kumon

SITE: NW Indiana Boys & Girls Club (Gary, IN)

TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED): various

NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 3

DATE: March 28, 2007

REVIEWERS: MC/ST

TIME OF OBSERVATION: 4:05 PM

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a mark of “Satisfactory” (S) or “Unsatisfactory” (U) for each component. Providers receiving a “U” in any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	S	U	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application	X		Three students were observed in the room. One student worked with a tutor individually using a number board. The student was instructed to match number tiles with the numbers that were written on the number board. The student was provided with help when necessary. Other students worked independently on packets of worksheets. Once they had completed each worksheet, they handed it to a tutor to be corrected. The tutor then handed the worksheet back with any corrections that were necessary. The lessons observed match the description in the provider's application.
Instruction is clear	X		Students seemed to understand what was expected of them. Tutors corrected assignments immediately and provided the corrections to the students, as described in the provider's original application. The tutor working one-to-one with the younger student provided feedback to the student and this student appeared to understand what was expected of him. At times, however, it was not always completely apparent that the student understood all concepts particularly in cases when the tutor gave the student the answer. The other tutors were not observed providing instruction to students as they graded student assignments.
Time on task is appropriate	X		Students generally remained on task. When they got students were off task, tutors generally noticed and asked them to return to concentrating on their work.
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	X		The tutors knew what lessons the students were supposed to be working on, and the students knew what was expected of them. Tutors appeared capable of using Kumon-issued grading books to correct the worksheets handed in by the students. Tutors provided corrections in a very quick manner. They all seemed familiar with the Kumon method.
Student/instructor ratio: <u>2:1</u>	X		At 2:1 or less, the ratio was less than the 5:1 described in the application.